

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application, based on the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

Claims 9-74 are pending in the present application. Claim 74 is new. Claims 9-73 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed April 19, 2004, the Examiner rejected Claims 9-36 and 42-67 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Robertazzi (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,989) in view of Hodroff (U.S. Patent 5,592,376) and Hortensius (U.S. Patent 5,917,629).

The Examiner also rejected Claims 37-41 and 68-72 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Robertazzi, Hodroff, and Hortensius in view of Besemer (U.S. Patent 4,245,306).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. However, in order to expedite prosecution, the claims have been amended to more precisely describe embodiments of the present invention, including, among other features, the elements of: **each said personal computer including at least one microchip having at least one microprocessor with at least one control unit and at least two processing units; and each said personal computer including at least one firewall.** In addition, specific hardware components, such as a telephone component in Claim 9, are claimed. As amended, independent Claims 9 and 42 include these features, which are supported by the specification.

Furthermore, newly added Claim 74 includes, among other features, the elements: **the server including at least one microchip having at least one microprocessor with at least one control unit and at least two processing units and the server including at least one firewall.**

The feature **each said personal computer (see Claims 9 and 42) or server (see Claim 74) including at least one microchip having at least one microprocessor with at least one control unit and at least two processing units** is supported by, for example, Figures 10A and 10C. The feature **each said personal computer (see Claims 9 and 42) or server (see Claim 74) including at least one firewall** is supported by, for example, Figures 10A and 10C. The various hardware components are supported by Figures 10A, 10C, 14A, 19, and page 21, lines 8-27 of the specification..

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the reference(s) must teach or suggest all limitations of the claim. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1970). Here, none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features: **each said personal computer or server including at least one microchip having at least one microprocessor with at least one control unit and at least two processing units; and each said personal computer or server including at least one firewall.**

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection be withdrawn with respect to the independent claims. In addition, Applicant notes that all remaining claims are dependent on independent Claims 9, 42 or 74, and are thus allowable.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the objections and rejections in the Office Action have been addressed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone should the Examiner believe that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

PIPER RUDNICK LLP



Dale Lazar
Registration No. 23,872
Attorney of Record

Lisa K. Norton
Registration No. 44,977

P.O. Box 9271
Reston, VA 20195
(202) 861-3871